

Bay Delta Conservation Plan (BDCP) Conservation Strategy (CS) Workgroup Meeting

April 9, 2007, 12:00 p.m. to 3:00 p.m.

Resources Agency Bldg., Room 1131

Draft Meeting Notes

Associated documents/handouts:

- Agenda
- Handout #1: Draft Conservation Objectives
- Handout #2: Draft Conservation Strategy Alternatives Descriptions
- Handout #3: Draft Conservation Strategy Alternatives Diagrams (Powerpoint)
- Handout #4: Conservation Themes and Stressors for Green and White Sturgeon (Draft Working Table)
- CS Workgroup 3/26/07 Draft Meeting Notes

Action Items and Key Recommendations

- Meeting Notes from 3/26 were adopted without changes
- A small group of interested members will convene before next CS Workgroup meeting to finish discussion on interim independent science input and will report back to CS Workgroup on 4/16.
- Future meetings will have shorter agendas to include sufficient time to review CSA's and short-listing criteria in greater depth

Meeting Notes Review and Adoption

3/26 meeting notes were adopted without changes.

Science Workgroup activities report

Brent Walthall, Co-chair of Science Workgroup, reported two main items from their meeting on 4/6:

- Structure of Independent Science Panel leadership: Workgroup will recommend to the Steering Committee having a strong facilitator and a lead scientist whose role is primarily coordinating science among panelists and with BDCP leadership. The Scope of Work for the Lead Scientist and Facilitator will be modeled after DFG templates; Laura Simonek and Ann Hayden will update them for proposal to Steering Committee.
- Interim science input: CALFED Independent Science Board (ISB) members will provide input to BDCP on an as-needed basis until BDCP science panel is being assembled.

Leo Winternitz announced that he will be coordinating a session for the principals of the five Delta planning processes (BDCP, Delta Vision, DRMS, DRERIP, CALFED) to coordinate their science efforts.

An extensive discussion ensued among Workgroup members regarding the interim independent science process. Closure was not achieved. Key unresolved points included how to identify and contact scientists, who would have access to those individuals, what questions they would be asked, which documents they might review, and how their feedback would be disseminated to the Workgroup. Some members felt strongly that the process should be flexible and informal, others suggested that more structure and communications planning would be beneficial. There is tension between staying within BDCP schedule and members' comfort with the level of independent science in the CS development process.

The workgroup generally concurred that the process for interim independent science could not be resolved in today's meeting and decided to continue the conversation in a small group meeting later this week. Laura King Moon will coordinate a meeting of interested members; the small group will report back to the Workgroup next Monday 4/16. See Action Items and Key Recommendations.

Handout #1: Revised Conservation Objectives (Pete Rawlings- SAIC)

The changes recommended last week were made; species resilience was included in Objective #3, and Objective #7 was removed as an objective and rewritten to reflect planning process and sustainability of plan elements.

Wording changes were suggested by members and will be made by SAIC, as follows:

Principle statement preceding the objectives in italics will be deleted.

Objective #1: Delete "levels of" and end sentence at "sources"

Objective #2: Change "improve" to "provide" and "support" to "enhance"

Objective #3: Insert "accessibility", change first "increase" to "provide" and second "increase" to "enhance," change "amount" to "quantity"

Objective #4: Change second "increase" to "enhance", add "quantity" and "accessibility" so it will read "Increase food quality and quantity to enhance ...and accessibility."

Objective #5: Remove "species" after "non-native"

SAIC asked for guidance on developing and applying the criteria that will be used to reduce the long list of CSA's. They will use the Planning Agreement, conservation objectives, key stressors on species, etc. The elements of the current draft CSA's will be filtered through the criteria and recombined into a shorter list of CSA's. Suggested types of criteria included consideration for:

- Feasibility
- Level of certainty
- Sustainable, flexible, durable
- Advance multiple objectives
- Benefit multiple species
- Reduce critical stressors
- The short list should include several broad CSA's, so when adding new criteria, consider whether they will help lend breadth to the short list

Members requested that CS Workgroup spend an entire meeting reviewing the CSA elements.

Handout #2 and #3: Draft Conservation Strategy Alternative Descriptions (Pete Rawlings- SAIC)

The CSA's were updated and specified further since their last presentation. Diagrams of the CSA's were also created.

Feedback to SAIC:

All CSA's: Be sure *Egeria* sp. is addressed

CSA #2: Explicitly differentiate marshes from floodplain and aquatic habitat

CSA #6: Suisun Marsh restoration is moving forward regardless for permit requirements with Reclamation, DWR, FWS, and NOAA, and is not likely to be significantly affected by BDCP decisions; it should be considered a common element of all CSA's

Handout #4: Conservation Themes and Stressors for Green and White Sturgeon (Draft Working Table) (Pete Rawlings- SAIC)

The table was presented briefly. It will be completed Wednesday 4/10/07 and CS Workgroup will review the final splittail and sturgeon tables in more depth at the next meeting.

Public comments

No comments at this meeting.

Next Meeting

Monday 4/16/07 same time and location.